

diameter of said hood is substantially identical along [the]  
a longitudinal length of said plurality of tines.

#### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above identified patent application is hereby respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claim 1 has been canceled and claims 2, 3, 4, 7, and 11 have been amended. Claims 2-11 remain in the case.

The applicant appreciated the thoroughness of the review by Examiner Truc T. Nguyen.

A petition and fee for a two month extension of time is attached hereto.

The title has been amended to recite, "Tine edge Electrical Contact" as the essence of the invention is to provide a tine that contacts a pin specifically on the edge of the tine. Reconsideration of the title is respectfully requested.

1-4. Claims 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for lack of antecedent basis.

Claims 6 recites "said tip" in the last line. Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and claim 5 originally introduced this element as "a tip". Accordingly, it is believed that proper antecedent basis has already been provided for this element and that therefore the rejection is overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner should still believe that there is not sufficient antecedent basis, the undersigned requests a more detailed explanation as to the basis for this belief.

Claim 11, line 8 (not line 7) has been amended to introduce the element with the indefinite article "a". The Examiner is appreciated for noticing this. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

5-6. The recitation of 35 U.S.C. 102 and the rejection of claims 2-3 by Knapp is noted.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to recite that the tine includes a secant (a line across the end of curved segment) that is disposed on the same side as is the pin.

Knapp et al clearly teaches the tines disposed in an opposite orientation, with their secants being disposed on an opposite side with respect to the pin.

This is a combination of elements absent the known prior art. It is substantial in that a tine having a lesser radius than that of the pin forces edge contact to occur, but only when the secant is on the same side as the pin, as claimed. Accordingly, all of the benefits as described in the specification are provided by the instant claimed combination and which are absent from the prior art.

The limitations of prior claim 7 have been incorporated into claims 2 and 3. Support for these amendments is found in original claim 7 and also throughout the specification and in the drawing figures. No new matter has been added nor is it believed that any new issues have been raised for consideration.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of instant base claims 2 and 3.

It is noted that Knapp Figures 1 and 3 show that the radius of the tine is clearly greater than that of the pin, even at the tip. For example, Figure 3 has each tine 22a

having a secant (distance from tip to tip) that is about equal to the diameter of the pin 10, yet the pin 10 includes 180 degrees of arc (i.e., one-half of a circle) in this distance whereas the tines 22a include much less arc, thereby proving that they possess a greater, not lesser, radius than that of the pin.

The original claims 2 and 3 recited a lesser radius for the tines than for the pin and accordingly were believed to already differentiate apart from the prior art. However, the instant amendments were made because it is believed that they introduce yet another element (the positioning of the secant) and so more particularly define the scope of the invention. Thereby, this issue is deemed to be moot and this difference in the reading of the prior art is noted so as to include it as part of the file.

7-9. The recitation of 35 U.S.C. 103 and the rejection of claims 1, 4, 7-11, over Knapp and with claims 5 and 6 also in view of Kerek, is noted.

Claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 4-11 depend from claim 4, which has been amended to include the newly added limitations of instant claims 2 and 3, which have been previously discussed hereinabove. The elements of prior

claim 7 have been included in amended claim 4 (and 2 and 3 as well). Accordingly, claim 7 has been amended only to maintain proper antecedent basis with instant base claim 4.

Accordingly, base claim 4 includes elements absent the known prior art. These elements would also then be absent from any applied combination. Reconsideration of instant base claim 4 and dependent claims 5-11 is respectfully requested.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure has been reviewed by the undersigned, but is deemed no more relevant than the applied references.

It is noted that the numeral "5" has been repeated and is used for two different parts of the Office Action. It is assumed that this is a typographical error and the numeral under "Conclusion" should be a "10" instead of a "5".

As this numeric repetition has had no effect on the preparation of this response, it is not deemed to be significant.

As all remaining claims 2-11 appear to be in condition of allowance, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested, and a notice of allowance is courteously urged at the earliest time.

8. The applicant appreciates the opportunity to communicate by telephone with the Examiner if necessary.

**Please direct all future correspondence to the new correspondence address and telephone as shown below.**

Respectfully submitted,

 November 19, 2002

Risto A. Rinne, Jr.

2173 East Francisco Blvd.  
Suite E  
San Rafael, CA 94901

1-415-457-6933